

The Coming Day.

OCTOBER, 1899.

HONESTY AND TRUTHFULNESS IN PUBLIC MEN,

OR

*Are public men in high places bound to be untrue
to what they know to be the best and wisest ?*

SPOKEN AT CROYDON.

ONE of our first duties here is to attempt to read the signs of the times. As a rule, it is our choice to look at the bright and hopeful signs ; but there are times when duty calls the other way : and I am sorry it is so to-day. The subject of our study to-day is—Are public men in high places bound to be untrue to what they know to be the best and wisest?—a study suggested by the Bishop of London's late lecture on 'Heroes.'

Reading the lecture carefully, it is a little difficult to know what was exactly in his lordship's mind,—so curiously did he hover between the tainted theory that great men may have to be great prevaricators, and the correct doctrine, that it is always right to be honest. A good half of the lecture was occupied with a description of the statesman's moral difficulties, and with trying to steer him with the help of the queer theory (especially queer for a bishop) that 'public morality differs from private morality,' though 'it is hard to determine in points of detail where the difference lies.' But we shall come to that presently.

It is a somewhat subtile lecture, and a rather risky argument, all turning upon the difference between private and public life, and actions great and small.

We must have heroes, says the bishop. 'Great events or great movements are only intelligible when described in the terms of individual en-

deavour.' They belong to human nature, and we can best represent and understand them by incarnating them as it were, in a person. Hence heroes.

Then the difficulty at once arises. We are apt to idealise the hero. Or else we blacken him. 'People like to deal with heroes or villains.' 'They like their pictures to be painted in vivid colours.' Hence the heroic is apt to be the romantic, and the hero is very much what we make him. 'As soon as a man has been voted a great man, it is necessary that he be maintained in all things at the level of his imputed greatness.' So we forget the low, the sordid or the mean, and exaggerate the high, the noble and the generous, and there again is the hero. But this is unhistorical and inexact. As the good bishop reminds us, while we regard Henry II. as a sagacious law-giver, we ought also to remember that he had an ungovernable temper; 'and it is well worth remembering that the great Duke of Marlborough, for all his courage in the field, trembled before his wife.'

And now comes the crux. The hero should be selected for two reasons, says the bishop: first, because he worked for principles which we believe to be fruitful, and which are our own by virtue of that belief; and second, because we wish him to be 'the inspirer of our own action,' as one who is 'capable of imitation.' But then comes the difficulty. He perhaps belongs to the past; his methods were probably entirely different from ours; and, if we look over-closely into his actions and methods, we may find that his position as hero turns only upon his achievements and his application of means to ends. Then, as the good bishop craftily says; 'We sorrowfully admit that the hero's methods are beyond our power in these days when law-courts are punctilious; and indeed were such that we have no wish to follow them, even if the law-courts made larger allowances than they do for the exigencies of public-spirited policy.'

That sounds a good deal satirical, and may have applications in our own day, when so many seem inclined to stand just clear of the law-courts, to make an economical use of the Ten Commandments, and to make very large allowances indeed 'for the exigencies of public-spirited policy.'

'Our first duty, therefore, seems to be to make allowance for the spirit of the age ;'—a delicate operation ! the upshot of which, indeed, often is the sordid conclusion that 'the hero knew the moral law, but dispensed himself from its observance for his own purpose.' And that also brings us to our own day, and to our own doors.

And here we come upon the sinister-looking reflections which have suggested to me this study. The bishop proceeds to deal with public men, and especially with statesmen, in our own day ; and all his remarks are based upon the unpleasant doctrine that 'there is a difference between public and private morality,—in regard to international matters, I presume, such as the acquisition of other people's territory, the destruction of their dwelling houses, grain and cattle, and the suppression of their forms of government, and of their free right to make what use they like of their own lives. In plain English, there is a difference between private murder, enslavement or theft, and public murder, enslavement or theft :—a dangerous doctrine ! But the bishop proceeds to particulars. The difference between public and private morality (as to justice, generosity and truth, I suppose) 'does not,' we are told, 'lie in the moral principles which regulate human conduct, but in the difficulty of applying them with sufficient accuracy in a sphere where ordinary guides and secondary motives do not exist.' Here are the first steps of our descent into this shady region. 'The great complexity of public affairs,' says the bishop, 'is continually forcing a statesman to deal with a matter which he would prefer not to deal with, and to put aside some other object which is near his heart. His moral enthusiasm may be prepared to flow in a particular direction, but he finds himself dragged in another direction, and has not time to gather his moral enthusiasm together and carry it with him. When he has settled this troublesome matter he will resume his morality, and apply it diligently to his great primary purpose. The wished-for opportunity rarely occurs.'

That is the bishop's description of the life and morale of a great statesman. It does not yet positively justify him for dropping his 'moral enthusiasm,' and going on without it : but it leaves

a bad taste in one's mouth, and all the more because, although he deprecates the suggestion that he is 'unduly introducing casuistry into the domain of morals,' he seems to be describing what is to be at least condoned.

The bishop tells us, with hardly a throb of disapprobation, that the statesman is often unable to face the problem before him 'simply in itself;' and then, having carefully led us up to it, he puts up the opportunist party man as our hero, thus; 'He has to ask, not only what is the best and wisest thing to do, but the further and more difficult question: How will it, if done, affect my party as a whole?'

What a low standard! But the bishop is equal to it. 'It may be said,' he remarks, 'that this is an unworthy attitude to assume; that a man ought to quit a position in which he feels that he cannot act up to the best he knows. This, however, is really impossible in human affairs. In accepting a post of responsibility the true man cuts himself off from the possibility of retreat.' And that is all this great teacher has to say! When a man sacrifices, in great affairs, 'the best and wisest,' and surrenders the best he knows, for the sake of an advantage to his party, he is told that he must not retreat, that he would not be 'a true man' if he did. In plain English, he must stick to his stifling of conscience; he must sacrifice right to success, and be a liar in order that he may be true. The bishop, in effect, praises the character whom Tennyson rightly condemns as one whose 'honour rooted in dishonour stood,' and he actually applies to such a man Dante's 'holding up to exceptional shame him who made the great refusal:' 'the great refusal,' according to the Bishop, being the refusal to lay the best and the wisest on the altar, as a sacrifice to party gain: so that if a man sacrifices his party, rather than sacrifice the best and the wisest, he is no 'true man,' he makes 'the great refusal,' and he is rightly held up to 'exceptional shame'! And that is the teaching of London, in this fading century! Does it indicate the duty or the policy of great bishops as well as of great statesmen? Is that the game which Dr. Temple and Dr. Creighton have been called in to play?

But the mob of French generals seem to hold the same views of duty. Personally, they do not want to lie, and conspire, and forge, and condemn an innocent man to die by inches: but their public and supreme duty is to save France, and the safety of France depends upon the supremacy of the army. Therefore, 'the best and wisest' in itself must give way to the best and safest for the army; and it is expedient that one man should be crucified for the sins of the military world, on public grounds. And that appears to be justified by the teaching of the Bishop of London.

What if a man like Sir Alfred Milner has also been true to this slimy standard? What if he is the bishop's 'true man,' who has sacrificed the best and the wisest to 'The South African League,' to Mr. Cecil Rhodes, to the Prince of Wales, to Mr. Chamberlain, and to his party? It is true that the bishop throws out here and there a conventional phrase of regret that this is so: but his description of the statesman, as one who must often sacrifice the best and the wisest, and who is the true man in doing so, is a serious endorsement of him. And then, after tracing him through his unclean but justified path, he says:—

A successful statesman is not troubled by the unfavourable opinion of his modes of action expressed by those whom he has vanquished. He is very much a law unto himself; he has little to help him to appreciate the future results of his policy; he is exposed to the temptation of thinking that success once achieved palliates all the methods taken to achieve it. The only direct consideration that can tend to check him in pursuing devious courses is, that deceit, when detected, begets distrust. But this need not trouble him much.

But here, I hasten to admit, and I gladly admit, that a touch of satire in this gives us hope that the bishop may, after all, be, at least partly, holding up some modern 'heroes' and statesmen to a sort of subtile scorn. One notable passage suggests it:—a very clever passage, and one which partly relieves the bishop from much that is painful enough. 'I admit,' he says;—

I admit that we are now dealing with a matter in which it is difficult to find a common standard of measurement. Supposing it is granted that territorial acquisition is desirable for a country's greatness and prosperity, I cannot determine the ratio between square miles of territory and moral elevation. Is a statesman who has annexed a province to be

regarded as so great a benefactor that his proceedings in so doing are above criticism? If not, how is the equation to be determined? I cannot tell how much bloodshed and how much lying are allowable per square mile. Either you must take the acquisition as justifying the means taken to acquire it, or, while you pocket the acquisition, you must gibbet sky-high the villain who won it for you.

That passage may be cited as a set-off against the clear endorsement of the statesman's tortuous courses, and it is only fair to add that the bishop, as I have already indicated, does give expression to good and wholesome ethical ideals, in such sentences as these ;—

No amount of testimony to good character can save a forger or a murderer from the penalty of his crime. We cannot in history extenuate deceit and fraud and treacherous bloodshed on grounds of general good intentions. We often praise a man too much for what we call his policy.

I am of opinion that we should be careful in the selection of heroes for our admiration. We should recognize in their selection the full weight of moral considerations; we should remember that if we palliate their misdeeds we are so far setting a bad example to their would-be successors.

It is the human element which counts most in the long run, it is the character of the man, not the nature of his achievements which gives abiding value to his work. History, if properly studied, tends to show that, after all, the great man was the good man, and that those only deserve our reverence and our imitation who brought a good heart as well as a strong head or an iron hand to the service of mankind.

I only wish this had been the consistent teaching of this perplexing study of heroes.

UNITY AND VARIETY IN RELIGION.

BY WILFRED VINER.

(Continued from page 265).

IV.

PERSONAL RELIGION. THE LIFE OF THE INDIVIDUAL PLANT.

Personal religion is a living thing or life. It is rooted in faith, reason, or assumed knowledge. It is supported by its stems which are the agencies and aids that form the channels of communication. The leaves are the emotions or

sentiments that absorb external influences. The flower is the profession, the gaudy attractive side of the plant, presented to the world. The fruit is the part of the flower representing religion in action.

All these organs of the plant, its roots, stems, leaves, flowers, taken together, represent the life of an individual plant or the apparent essentials of a religious life.

Its Roots or the Criteria of Truth.

I abhor two principles in religion, and pity those who use them—the first is obedience on authority without conviction, the other is persecuting those who differ from us for God's sake. Such a religion is without judgment, though not without teeth.—WILLIAM PENN.

With our limited faculties we seemed to be incapable of ascertaining the absolute truth in regard to all subjects of enquiry. This need not be a barrier to our seeking to discover what we may conceive to be the truth concerning religion although it may be considered a speculative subject if we decline to accept any evidence that lies beyond the scope of our senses.

We may endeavour to form our opinions upon knowledge, faith, or reason. To avoid confusion we will define the arbitrary meanings we imply by these terms.

Knowledge or positive truth assumes that the proposition is self evident. It is perceptible to our senses, therefore it does not require any further proof.

Faith or testimony is a reliance upon the statements of another. When associated with the emphatic affirmation of authority it is dogmatical truth.

Reason or rational truth is arrived at by a process of reasoning. Facts not provable by observation may be presumptively deduced from premises that have already been proved.

Many religionists claim to base their belief on faith, reason and knowledge, and it is only fair to point out that implicit or blind faith may be only the first stage of a confirmed faith ensuing from reason. This advanced stage of faith is apparently the verification of the elementary

faith by logical conclusions formed from reasonable inferences.

Dogmatical faith, at the outset, pertains to doctrines that are settled and promulgated by authority, to be received and believed implicitly. It commands us in domineering terms to accept the guidance of church, teacher or book; we are to subordinate our reason, the subjects involved being considered beyond the scope of our intellects, they therefore can only be apprehended by a faith in supernatural assistance.

We have not freedom of thought to select our rudimental opinions. They are already beneficently provided for us by a Divine Providence.

Freedom of thought has been defined by Kant as 'The advance of man beyond the state of voluntary immaturity.' By immaturity he means inability to use our own understanding except under the guidance of another. This immaturity is voluntary when the cause of it is not want of intelligence, but of resolution and courage to use it without another's guidance.*

The conclusions of science are most attractive, but its province, in a general way, is limited to phenomena and it is therefore outside religious aims and ends.

The attempt to prove the doctrine of religion to the satisfaction of a materialist ends in failure. It only fosters the Agnosticism or Atheism of the present day. All religious convictions seem dependent upon faith or probabilism. At present we can see only the obverse side of supersensible truth. In another sphere we may see the reverse side and attain to absolute knowledge. The mysteries that are within the veil may seem insoluble, yet we may learn enough of them to judge of the 'rationally probable or the irrationally improbable,' for our reflective faculties are designed to balance these probabilities.

We therefore are led to conclude that the only course open to us,—if positive knowledge is unattainable, and we decline to accept dogmatical teaching off-hand,—is to form logical conclusions, for logic is but the art of reasoning especially from

* Pfleiderer's 'Development of Theology.'

inferences, and probability is often a safe guide in ordinary affairs. It is true we thus become Free-thinkers, but this only means that we claim the liberty of thinking as we like on religious matters, and we will let others think as they like, for whichever head our roots may be classed under surely cannot matter provided we develop into a flower which grows into the fruit containing the seeds.

The Stems, or the Agencies and Aids of Religion.

For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right.—POPE.

The agencies and aids, the causes, means and helps that support the plant, appear to be the stems of religion that form the channels of communication between the groundwork and the flower. As most stems are exposed to the daylight, so the majority of people prefer to live surrounded by the externals of religion, but it is well to remember there are growing stems concealed from view, for they develop underground.

The organised machinery of religions and churches is designed to propagate doctrines and dogmas, to secure the formal assent of the populace, to impart the benefits of assemblage, and to rescue or elevate mankind.

Some religions are established by the State, others aim to control States. Civil Governments support the churches because established faiths tend to promote social order and personal decorum, and to preserve caste.

The acquirements of civilisation in the departments of literature, education, art, architecture, painting and sculpture, are applied to the purposes of organised religion.

Religious literature ranges from inspired books, learned essays, reviews and treatises, to novels, penny papers and household tracts. Magnificent temples, cathedrals, mosques and pagodas, are supplemented by unpretending meeting houses and places of worship in the open air. The most aesthetical and elaborate ceremonial is contemporaneous with the simple worship of the Puritan or the intellectual contemplations of the Rationalist. Church music varies from a classical concert to a street shout. The priest or preacher may be

an eminent scholar or an ignoramus. He may be paid to live in a palace, or he may work for love only and live in a slum.

Religious teaching may be dogmatical and authoritative, or rational and persuasive. It may insist upon a strict self denial or allow us to make the best of both worlds. It may seek to control our property and families, to instruct us as to diet, costume and occupation, or it may allow a freedom and laxity of life. Supported by the wealthy it may disseminate theories intended to reconcile the inequalities of social position, or it may foster the idea of a human brotherhood on earth.

This variety of religion places it within the reach of the poor and the ignorant, as well as the wealthy and educated. All the methods and agencies may be helpful to those who are disposed to take what is prescribed for them. If the treatment suits, by all means let it be continued. We only prefer for ourselves to decline its complications.

We cannot over-estimate the high qualities of some consistent Christians but we are of opinion that had these been brought up Buddhists, and had Buddhism developed in a higher state of civilisation, the virtues of these excellent people would be equally apparent in other clothing, for religion is surely independent of the distinctions of church and creed.

The agencies and aids are but means to an end, they are the instruments used to effect the operation, the theoretical channels of practical religion.

The claims of the churches to be the embodiment of all true religion seem unwarrantable, for piety and morality surely existed prior to the establishment of churches, while goodness and devotion continue independently of organised systems of faith.

Ecclesiastical systems are associated with faith or dogmatical truth. Their doctrines and dogmas are expressed in absolute creeds which are considered essential for the maintenance of orthodoxy, while all who seek a reasonable belief, outside the pale of the churches, have unconditional freedom of thought. The statutory systems of religion authoritatively assert that all

moral conduct, even if associated with natural religion, is a barren production apart from what we term the externals of religion.

Is it reasonable to suppose that any particular religion or church can be the solitary channel of divine grace? The outward rites and ceremonies, that usually involve priestly interference, may be helpful to those who rely upon the apparatus of religion to enable them to communicate with the Infinite spirit, but these external acts of worship hamper others who 'seek to worship Him in spirit and in truth'; we therefore conclude they are unessential to an intellectual religious life.

Popular preaching may exercise a temporary magnetic influence. Forms of prayer to be used in public may assist the true minded or foster hypocrisy. Mystical church services with brilliant appendages, vestments, genuflections, and gorgeous paraphernalia borrowed from heathenism, may be accessories to the sensual manifestations of religion, but we are inclined to view them as the mere shells of an intellectual religion.

If we believe in a Providence, we can approach Him fearlessly without the intervention of a mediator, the assistance of ritual, or the interference of priestly authority. We can beneficially signify our anxiety to conform to His will and purposes without expressing our selfish petitions which if they were gratified might prove disadvantageous to our welfare.

Our belief in the higher power, who is a Perpetual Providence, who has constituted us spiritual beings, will prove a sufficient cause to impel us towards godliness, and support the higher life we are privileged to lead. We can dispense with external human agencies and aids in their present form. Our reverential devotion which may, like Carlyle's, be expressed in the 'great cathedral of immensity,' will furnish us with a channel of communication through which we may receive the Divine impulses that are so important for the animation of our spiritual life.

The Leaves, or the Sentiments of Religion.

A great and ever present danger connected with aesthetic and symbolic worship is that, being sensuous, it

is very liable to deteriorate into an emotional worship, which satisfied a mood but did not regenerate and sanctify the life.—Dr. PERCIVAL, Bishop of Hereford.

Religion has been defined as ‘Morality touched by emotion.’ These emotions, or religious sentiments, we view as the leaves or garments of the plant which, apart from a faith or belief, appear to be inoperative.

The mysterious and the reverential have aided the evolution of universal religion. Conceptions of the higher Power and the universe of spirit raise the emotions to the highest pitch of veneration and wonder. Impressions of vast power or incalculable numeration fill us with fear and awe.

The apparatus of religion inspires religious feeling that may prompt our religious thought. Poetry, art, painting, sculpture, by their insinuating ideals, aesthetical public worship with its symbolic ritual and ceremonial, attracts and fascinates our eyes and ears, producing a hallowed frame of mind. Popular magnetic preaching with boisterous prayers and ‘revival hymns’ awakens fear and awe, producing in some constitutions a violent agitation of the mind approaching to distraction.

These influences acting on our feelings may awaken or intensify the sense of duty or responsibility that issues in a higher life if they co-operate with the teachings of authority or the dictates of reason. The garments of religion will form useful accessories if subjective to the intellectual faculties. They prove themselves useful to some natures that cannot live without continual excitement: but uncontrolled emotion or excessive enthusiasm seems to lead to a fitful and imaginary life, for it tends to paralyse the action of the mind, which is so necessary to the maintenance of the faith or belief that incites consistent conduct.

In religion, as in everything else, we must avoid excesses, not undervaluing the uses of its leaves for they further the sustentation and growth of the plant by absorbing and utilising its external influences.

The Flowers and the Fruit. The Profession and Practice of Religion.

Man forms his judgment from the outward part
But God takes photographs of soul and heart.

—FENELON.

The flower of the plant viewed externally is the gaudy or attractive side presented to the world which contains within it the life that developes into the fruit containing the seeds.

We have examined the groundwork in which the plant is embedded, the roots by which it is fixed to the ground, the stems by which it is supported, the leaves that form its garments, now an analogy falters for we find that the profession or acknowledgment may exist with or without the sense of duty or responsibility that leads to a higher life. In other words religion may be theoretical, or practical, or both.

We have learned from the universal distribution of religion that nearly all mankind profess it in some way, that there is a general tendency for people to acknowledge the faiths in which they have been trained, that public opinion and social custom lead them to ostensibly conform to the customary ceremonials of the country in which they live. This profession of the individual necessarily takes different forms in different places. For an example let us glance at the outer life of an average orthodox religious Englishman, to illustrate what we mean by the flowers of religion.

The central *point d'appui* is the church life to which the orthodox Christian is rivetted by the magnetic attraction of a community. He is a regular attender or worshiper in the temple, the consecrated edifice devoted solely to the service of God, where priest or minister conducts the services according to a fixed unchangeable pattern. He may unite himself with those who highly value ritual and ceremonial, early communion or mass, or join himself to others who set the greatest store on sermon, prayer meeting and outdoor revival services.

If he becomes an active member of the church, the Sunday school, guild meeting, church meeting, members' meeting, tea meeting, missionary meeting, Bible reading, and the customary round of religious exercises will occupy the greater part of his spare time and utilise most of his spare cash.

This church-life is essentially of a social kind. Most of his intimate acquaintanceships and relationships are usually formed through his church mem-

bership. All his activities revolve within the little circle he moves in. In this sphere there is a continual restraint upon his conduct. When he has to move in wider circles he may make a profession in his conversation or by his conduct, or he may not.

In family life the orthodox Christian may have family prayer or insist upon regulating the lives of his family and servants in accordance with his own persuasions. In his home he may set a good example by his consistent conduct and conversation, or he may not. In private life his actions will reveal his profession. He may read or study his Bible, Prayer Book or missal and control his appetites, desires, amusements and occupations. Thus in all the engagements and activities of life, at all times and in all places, in the temple, the mart, the social or the family circle, in business or in pleasure, religion may appear to monopolise and dominate his entire life.

The religious opinions embraced would probably depend upon the church or sect he belonged to. A low Churchman or a Dissenter, taking the Bible as his rule of faith, would insist upon the particular views of biblical teaching that form the creed or test of membership in the church of his choice. He would give prominence to the doctrines of atonement, or 'salvation by the blood,' which manifest their efficiency in the lives of converted men, whose futures depend upon a certain belief that theoretically elevates faith above morals, but, when the believers are consistent, practically results in godly lives.

A High Churchman or a Roman Catholic, basing his faith upon the authority of the Church and its interpretation of the Bible would insist upon the dogmas of priestly absolution and salvation by works. According to his idea, religion would mean a moral life supported by the 'indwelling Christ of the eucharist' and a ceremonial compliance with the practices of 'the only true and historical church.'

Many writers who refer to the profession of religion, although they persist in asserting its utility, are continually pointing to the inconsistencies of the inconsistent or the dangers of incon-

sistency. Let us be content to view the outward expression as a fact worthy of admiration without seeking to appraise its value. We will not criticise the methods favoured, the opinions held, the profession assumed, rather let us view them indiscriminately so long as they appear to assist in the fulfilment of the divine purpose which we conclude is the moral welfare and improvement of humanity individually and collectively.

The highest development of the plant is the fruit, the practical religion without which all the profession is fruitless, for this practical side involves the internal as well as the external constituents of the religious life of the individual.

Theoretical religion has distinguishing features relating to manifold conceptions of deity as a supreme power or being who assumes various phases of manifestation. It refers to diverse opinions in regard to doctrines, dogmas, creeds, ceremonies, agencies, and externals.

Practical religion has common resemblances. It everywhere disposes humanity to do what they conceive to be right and to seek that 'happiness which belongs to righteousness.' Draper has simply yet beautifully defined it as 'towards God—veneration, in personal life—purity, in social life—benevolence.'

The beneficial effects of the practical religion issuing from all the faiths and beliefs, as well as their theoretical peculiarities, depend upon the stage of their progress. Their serviceable values accord with the extent to which they have promoted ideas of duty or responsibility to a higher power; engendered feelings of admiration at His works or awakened sympathy towards our fellow-men; in short, the part they have played in the improvement of humanity.

The belief in a providence, the sense of duty or responsibility awakened by the idea that we are moral spiritual beings, may result in the practice of a higher life that leads the orthodox or unorthodox to control their lower animal natures. We may be raised to the elevation of the superior man although perchance we have had to overcome the adverse influences of an unsatisfactory early environment.

The superior man aims to live up to his ideals

of justice, generosity, temperance, amiability and tolerance, yet he is not only anxious for a self-improvement that develops his almost divine faculties but he seeks to sink his egoism in altruism, to live a life of usefulness, full of good works and deeds. He devotes his spare cash to the temporal requirements of his poorer brethren, he supports educational and charitable institutions, seeking to take his part in the eradication of moral evil, to alleviate the burdens and ameliorate the circumstances of his fellow men. If he has no spare cash, he gives his spare time which is correspondingly valuable and indispensable. In either case his religion takes an active and practical rather than a passive and theoretical form.

(To be concluded.)

THE NEW 'JOSHUA.'*

THIS latest contribution to 'The Polychrome Bible' brings us back strongly to the 'Polychrome' specialty of this remarkable undertaking. Some pages suggest a patchwork quilt rather than the results of a sober and scholarly analysis of ancient documents. But the intense gravity of the whole thing overcomes every other consideration. The colours used indicate that this small book is an exceedingly composite work, the fragments of which may be assigned to various dates between, say, 400 B.C. and 850 B.C. What are we to make of a pamphlet or story like that?

The honest scholar who translates and comments upon it tells us; and what he tells us leads to the conclusion that if it is a part of the supernaturally inspired and perfect 'Word of God,' we are, apparently, still waiting for that 'Word' to emerge from the chaos of editors, copyists and translators.

The truth is that the book, like many other books in the Bible, is a make-up of history, poetry, magic, opinion and misunderstanding. As such it

* 'The Book of Joshua. A new English Translation, printed in colours exhibiting the composite structure of the Book; with Explanatory Notes and Pictorial Illustrations.' By the Rev. W. H. Bennett, M.A. London: James Clarke & Co.

is immensely interesting, but as such it cannot be what is usually known as 'a divine revelation.' The note on Ch. x. 12-14 partly illustrates this. The story, it appears, is a blend of two interpolations, one belonging to a document dating from 570-540 B.C., and another to an old fragment going back to 850 B.C.: so we have the little legend printed in green and dark red. Then here is a disentangling comment;—

The quotation is poetic and figurative, as in the Song of Deborah—Jud. v. 20—the stars fought against Sisera: it seems, however, to have been misunderstood and taken literally by subsequent editors. It means simply: May God grant us victory before the sun sets. Similarly Agamemnon prays to Zeus that the sun may not set before Priam's dwelling is overthrown. (Il. 2, 413 ff.) At the bidding of Athene, the sunset was delayed for the sake of Ulysses (Od. 23, 241 ff.), and, on another occasion, hastened at the command of Hera, in order to save the Greeks (Il. 18, 239 ff.). . . . There is no reason to suppose that the narrative originally stated that a miracle happened.

This is perhaps as good an instance as could be selected, to indicate the special work done by this novel and valuable production. We have only to add that this volume is presented in a highly creditable manner. Type, paper, illustrations, are all of a high order, and, at 6s. (full price) it cannot be said to be dear.

THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE TRANSVAAL.

CAMPAIGN NOTES DAY BY DAY.

Intended to 'hold the mirror up to'—thieves.

I.

PROVOCATION.

It is being said that the President of the Republic and the Raad are to blame for raising the question of 'suzerainty' just now. What short memories men have! or how easily we think and say things that help us for the moment! Mr. Chamberlain has never ceased to put in that particular sting of 'suzerainty,' and to base his demands upon it.

The following letter was written to *The Daily News* long before Mr. Kruger's late reference to the matter, but was not printed, although it was exactly timed to expose this gratuitously provocative course of Mr. Chamberlain;—

If Mr. Chamberlain is not playing a provocative game, he has only himself to blame for the wide-spread opinion that he is. Just at a critical moment, he always contrives to get in the particular provocation which is most likely to quench a flicker of goodwill or fan a dangerous flame. For instance, it was so yesterday. The special sensitiveness of Pretoria at the moment is the shrinking from undue interference with the independence of the Republic: and so Mr. Chamberlain selects that moment for another masterful and pushing assertion of 'suzerainty.' He must have known that this would serve a double purpose;—irritate the Republic abroad, and inflame the pugnacity of the raiding party at home. He must have known, too, that this would also tend to effectually prevent the fruition of peaceful counsels.

Now, that claim to 'suzerainty' is an insolence and a fraud. The existing Convention is not only innocent of it, but Lord Derby's own hand deliberately deleted it from the old Convention which formed the basis of the new. If the old suzerainty had been insisted upon, the present Convention would never have been accepted by the Boers: that is well known: and, as a matter of fact, it was formally given up when the Republic, as an independent State, was brought into existence.

One naturally supposes that Mr. Chamberlain knows all that. If he does, why does he persist in a bit of sharp practice which must be as irritating as it is unjust?

II.

A MASTER VOICE FROM THE TRANSVAAL.

We invite the most serious attention of all England to 'An Earnest Representation and Historical Reminder to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, in view of the present crisis.' By P. J. Joubert, Vice-President of the South African Republic and Commander-in-chief of its forces. This important document can be had from 'The Transvaal Committee,' St. Ermin's Mansions, London, S.W. We believe copies are being sent gratis to applicants, but, as this is a twenty-four page publication, and as the Committee is doing a great deal of gratuitous work, applicants would do well to enclose a few stamps. But the main thing is to apply at once for as many copies as can be used. We would also strongly recommend a 'Special Transvaal number' of 'Hollandia,' containing a spirited and most

informing collection of testimonies concerning the real facts of the case. It is published at the nominal price of One Penny, and is dated from 110, St. Martin's Lane, London. For 1½d. it will be sent to any address.

III.

A SINISTER ADMISSION.

The unscrupulous gang who have been exhausting all their ingenuity to find the sensitive part, the kicking of which might lead to an excuse for raiding the South African Republic, have at last hit upon the sore place. Schools were tried, the liquor laws were attempted, the police attack upon a rowdy bicycle rider or a murderous ruffian, the price of dynamite and lucifer matches, the use of the Dutch language, and the right to vote, were all, in turn, utilised : but all failed to yield a sufficiently vulnerable point. That, however, it is hoped, with Mr. Chamberlain's help, is now found in the mysterious and dishonest claim to 'suzerainty';—'mysterious' because nobody quite knows what it means, and 'dishonest' because, in making the new (and existing) Convention, it was plainly and deliberately surrendered.

We were lately told, by the agent of *The Times*, that great alarm existed lest the negotiations should be prolonged : but, said this sinister provoker of strife, 'the better-informed opinion hardly accepts this view, but thinks we are now nearing a critical stage in the negotiations. It seems possible now that suzerainty rather than franchise will take the first place in the controversy.' That is to say, we hope we have found the raw place at last, the suitable slashing at which may lead to the desired disturbance and the final rush. What devilry it is !

IV.

THE 'CHRISTIAN' VIEW.

The Christian World has, from the first, been almost as rough and prejudiced as *The Referee*, and quite as one-sided and masterful as *The Times*. It seems to rely a good deal upon what it presents to us as anonymous Johannesburg grievance-mongering : and we all know now the significance of

that. It is all painted a glaring red, without perspective and without discrimination,—a sorrowful instance of British Philistinism. In one of its latest harsh deliverances, *The Christian World* refers in an ugly way to ‘the inevitable destiny of the territory on which the Boers pitched for their experiment,’ and then it lectures them (from saintly London!) on their ‘corruption’ and sneers at Mr. Kruger’s pious phrasing, just as people have sneered at Oliver Cromwell for the same. Then its precious anonymous correspondent at Johannesburg tries, in a scandalous way, to saddle upon the moral Boers the immoralities of that Europe-infected place!

The Christian World threatens the Republic with ‘an outburst of violence (on the part of the Outlanders) compared with which the wicked Jameson raid was a mere picnic!’ It is doing not a little to provoke or encourage it. But these Outlanders are getting a little sick of their experiment.

V.

THE BULLY’S HURRY.

We talk of having given independence to the Boers on conditions. Is it not a fact that we gave that independence only after brutally cheating them out of it? It was a restoration of stolen property.

We talk of hurrying our demands, and demands for what?—a granting of the Franchise and a Redistribution of Seats! A writer in *Concord* pithily says;—

Let those who are inclined to sneer at patience remember that for over fifty years in England a majority in the House of Commons was returned by, comparatively speaking, a mere handful of electors, an insignificant minority in the State, and that it took over one hundred years of agitation, from 1779 to 1884, to place the Franchise on a broad democratic basis. Yet during the whole of that time there was no talk of war save once, in 1832, when the Lords threw themselves in opposition to the Commons.

VI.

THE ‘UNCTUOUS RECTITUDE’ OF ENGLAND.

[The following was sent to *The Times*.]

‘Your touching remarks concerning Dreyfus and the wrong done to him puzzle a great many people,

who have keenly felt the mercilessness of your unjust harrying of the South African Republic, which is as much the victim of conspiracy, forgery and falsehood.

‘Still, as of old, it is so easy,—and it seems specially easy for an Englishman—to see the mote in a Frenchman’s eye, even through the beam in his own.’

VII.

HYPOCRISY.

If anything were needed to make certain the bad faith of our ‘rulers,’ their choice of a ‘grievance’ supplies it. This indecent haste to turn Englishmen into South African republicans ought to deceive no one. What can be our object in threatening to fight the Republic if it does not denationalise our countrymen fast enough? Is it a wonder that the Boers say; ‘You first tried to steal our country by violence, and now you are trying to get it by cunning’? And they are right.

VIII.

A TYPICAL RAIDER.

This, from *The Daily Chronicle*, is very enlightening;

At Bolton yesterday a man named Clinch, whose son is one of the Sheffield United full backs, was bound over to keep the peace. Amid great laughter he intimated his intention to go and fight the Boers, and take his 6ft. sons with him. The amusement was intensified when, in his excitement, he said his sons were six-footed.

Of course there is a good deal of anti-Boer emotion which Clinch does not represent: but Clinch, the full back, Clinch bound over to keep the peace, Clinch intending to go and fight the Boers, with his six-footers, all admirably indicate the sort of swaggering animalism we have had to deal with all through.

IX.

HYSTERICIS AND ETHICS.

The London *Evening News*, which is nothing if not hysterical, screamed over the Dreyfus verdict; but its screaming over Dreyfus is only equalled by its brutality in hounding on the country to a wicked

onslaught upon President Kruger and the Boers. Its own abetting of conspiracy and lying against the South African Republic is every bit as odious as the abetting of conspiracy and lying by the French generals:—if anything, worse.

Every day, in company with the *St. James' Gazette*, *The Times*, and other papers, it puts the worst construction on everything, and invents a provocation if one does not exist. At the most critical moment, it never fails to bully. For instance, when the Cabinet's peremptory message had to be replied to, and when the greatest care was necessary, these were its principal statements and headings, in large type:—

The telegrams stating that the situation is now clearer, are doing infinite harm.

It is foolish to repeat the mistake of regarding President Kruger and Mr. Smuts as civilised diplomatists.

Truculent reply expected from the Transvaal Government.

Developments expected in case Kruger attempts to further shuffle or evade.

The Evening News screamed, in its largest type, for the creating of a new 'British Legion of Honour,' to consist of Englishmen who will boycott France. 'A Legion of Honour,' forsooth, proposed by *The Evening News*!

X.

BEATEN BACK.

We have every reason to believe that this rank conspiracy is finally scotched, thanks to the superb patience and pluck of the Republic and to the vigorous friends of justice and freedom in this country. Mr. Chamberlain, in his latest despatch, cleverly dropped the burning questions, and clearly shewed his desire to wash his hands of the whole thing. We have all along strongly advocated the franchise for the Outlanders. The fight has been over the period for retrospection,—nine years, seven or five. Mr. Page Hopps, long ago, said two! The fun will begin when the offer is made to British Outlanders to cease to be Britons, and when they decline. But Mr. Rhodes and his rascals will still have to be watched over the process of naturalisation and at the polls!

XI.

A SHARPER'S TRICK.

Almost at the last moment, before sending these notes to press, we discover Sir A. Milner shewing the cloven foot, in falling back upon the old abrogated Convention of 1881 in order to get his 'Suzerainty.' It is a very dishonourable dodge. An Englishman's word used to be his bond: but now an Englishman's bond is not his word. But is it Sir A. Milner? or is it the old thing over again;—General Stewart took snuff and Lieutenant Hawker sneezed?

Anyway, if the British Government tries to evade the only existing Convention, that of 1884, there will be war after all. The one thing we need is to get rid of Joseph Chamberlain and his sharp practice.

XII.

VAMPIRES.

On a very critical day when, above all others, war seemed likely, crowds of people assembled to cheer certain officers who were going out to the Cape for the Transvaal. *The Star* says;

Mr. Fleetwood Wilson, acting Under-Secretary at the War Office, was at the station, and was busily engaged with General White up to a few minutes before the departure of the train. As the train was set in motion, someone in the crowd shouted to the members of Sir George's staff that they hoped they would not have an idle journey; and a reply came, "It looks very hopeful at present."

Hopeful! War is indeed Hell; as a great soldier once said: but, even so, it does not follow that soldiers should be gloating devils.

The Daily News printed in its largest type, sensational descriptions of the departure of soldiers amid yells of delight. Here is a glimpse. After describing the animal fitness of the men, it says;

But there was manifestly another cause for the men's contented frame of mind. They made no secret of the joy with which the thought of fighting filled them. By the by, they have no doubt about the drawing of the sword. "I'm sure of it," one said to me; adding enthusiastically, "And I say—We'll let 'em have it this time." Others with whom I conversed spoke in the same strain. Tommy Atkins, it was clear, has long nursed thoughts of vengeance against the Boers.

And this is the sort of thing we are asked to respect and admire! It is our Devil.

LICENSED BUCCANEERING.

Unity, which has done good work, in its steady protest against the policy of the United States in the Philippines, prints a highly instructive article upon a letter to the President, by the Rev. C. F. Dole. We reprint it here, because part of it applies to much that is going on to-day elsewhere. If we are to have any alliance with the United States, we should like it to be an alliance with such men as Mr. Dole and the editor of *Unity*, not with those Mr. Chamberlain had in his mind when he suggested that Great Britain and America could defy the world. We don't want to 'defy the world.' That sort of pugnacious swagger belongs to the Dark Ages:—

Charles F. Dole, pastor of the Unitarian Church of Jamaica Plains, Boston, has forwarded, through Secretary Long, a calm, searching and dignified letter, which must carry weight to the President, coming from an individual carrying the reputation for sanity and humanity which Mr. Dole does. But still more weight should it carry when it voices the sentiment of millions of citizens in this country. That it does not represent the sentiment of a majority of the voters is quite probable, but who will claim that the majority of the voters represents the major wisdom and sobriety of America, particularly when it is remembered that one-half of the population, and that half perhaps the more sober and sane on these questions, are not voters. Mr. Dole tells the President that he does not 'come with a word of censure,' while he is 'sore over the shame and bloodshed in which our country is now involved.' He does not regard the one who 'has led us upon this terrible course as either dishonest or inhuman.' Among the causes which have led to this serious mistake, he counts first an under-estimation of the character of the people we have undertaken to subjugate. They who are hastily judged as 'little better than barbarians' are at least as far civilised as the inhabitants of Venezuela or any Spanish state. They have schools, churches, courts and laws, and love their liberties very much as we do. Second, a mistaken idea as to the power of purchasing land without the consent of those who live upon it. 'How could we assume what was not ours to give?' Third, race prejudice has brought support to the administration. 'If the colour of the Malay skin is to be changed to white to-morrow, the war to compel their subjugation would cease by universal acclaim.' The President has told us, in the fourth place, that he has been lead astray by his own benevolent intentions. It 'does not follow because we mean well that the other man upon whose toes we tread will understand our kindness.' His kind messages would be hard for the natives to understand in any case, still harder when interpreted by the 'great guns of warships destroying miles of villages.' Mr. Dole urges, in the fifth place, that, however

good his own intentions, 'ugly threats of commercialism, naval supremacy, militarism, national aggrandizement, selfishness and arrogance have been woven into his loom.' He tells the President that Mr. Denby, one of and probably the leading expert of his own commission, is on record 'for the expression of quite brutal unconcern for the welfare of the Philippine people.' Campaigns aggregating millions of capital are being formed for the exploiting of their lands. Mr. Dole tells the President that he has been destroying the fair timber out of which suitable government ought to have been framed, laying up a store of hate against the American name. Neither does this citizen shrink from the knock-down demand of the friends of war, 'What do you recommend? What are we to do?' Mr. Dole, in the simplicity of ethics, assumes that the first thing to be done when a mistake has been made is to confess the mistake and undertake to repay the injustice. Let us not fear to say all that is true. Let us not fear to seem to brown men to 'back down' if it would be right in a similar case to 'back down' before white men. In conclusion, Mr. Dole assures the President that 'we shall never win or conciliate the Filipinos while we are shelling their towns, and a commission that contains Mr. Otis and Mr. Denby will never help us in this matter.' Mr. Dole presumes that the President believes in the Christian principles laid down in the Sermon on the Mount, and begs of him to give them a trial, and if a commission is to be appointed let it be a commission of men who believe in them, such as Herbert Welsh and Felix Adler. Let them take the single message to the Filipinos that 'the American nation are their friends; that we want nothing except to show ourselves friendly. Do not imagine, Mr. President, that you have carried this message to them yet. Do not think that it will be easy to reverse the hostile impression which our free use of the military arms of barbarism has already made upon these unhappy people. May not that for which I pray in the name of many thousands of patriotic Americans be the way of duty, and therefore of honor. What could the historian say of greater praise for your own name than this: "He led the American people to right a great wrong?"'

Many other protests of a similar character could be cited. Giles B. Stebbins, a well-known author and speaker, writes;—

There is more true 'pure and undefiled religion' in Abraham Lincoln's ideal of 'a government of the people, for the people, and by the people,' than in a large proportion of the thousands of sermons heard each week by millions of people: more inspiration in our Declaration of Independence, with its basic idea of man's God-given and inalienable rights to life and liberty, than in piles of theological dogmas: more practical righteousness in following, as we have done in the past, the advice of George Washington—to keep clear of foreign entanglements, and avoid all wars for conquest—than in paying heed to 'Imperial' cries against Filipino 'rebels.'

The Cuban war was fairly declared as for Cuban independence. With the Filipinos *we never declared war!* We

bought them of Spain without their consent, and are trying to conquer them—'paying \$20,000,000 for a hornet's nest!' as Carnegie shrewdly said.

A treaty of peace is signed with Spain; a fierce war rages against the Filipinos; thousands of our soldiers have died in battles and by pestilence; over twenty per cent. of our army are unfit for duty, sick with tropical diseases; millions are being lavishly spent, and the end is not yet—although Gen. Otis said months ago, that when his army took the field the rebellion would probably soon end.

Doubtless negotiations would be difficult; for we began, not by any decent recognition of the rights of the Filipinos as men, but by treating them as 'rebels' to be smitten down in battle—a grave mistake which must be remedied.

Never before did our army and navy go to a foreign land on a bloody errand of conquest. To succeed in that errand would bring no glory.

The Open Court, a high-class monthly, after admitting that 'our Government made mistakes in the very beginning, says;—

It is the duty of our nation to establish order in the Philippines, and to give the Filipinos full liberty of home government, retaining for the United States Government nothing except perhaps the possession of Cavite, together with other strategic points of the harbour of Manila, and the recognition of a protectorate. Yet the latter should be drawn up in the form of an alliance, as an older brother would treat a younger brother, with rights similar to those the territories of the United States possessed, and nothing should be contained in the treaty which might savour of Imperialism, or indicate the conception that the Filipino Republic is subject to the United States.

Still, on the whole, we are truly sorry to say that France and America are sore discouragements to us just now, as sympathisers with republican ideals.

WHAT GLADSTONE SAID.

LAST month we quoted from a speech by Mr. Gladstone, on the Transvaal, setting forth his reasons for restoring it to its owners. Here are other quotations from his speeches, on our assertion of Imperial claims in South Africa:—

We are not without experience of war in South Africa. It is a melancholy history. We have not had a Colony in South Africa yet for a century, but we had wars in 1811, in 1819, in 1834, in 1846, in 1850, in 1877, in 1879, and in 1880-1.

The people of England know something of these wars. £12,000,000, I am persuaded, do not represent it. The cost of the Zulu war was £4,890,000, the military operations in the Transvaal cost £2,720,000, and in the earlier times the war between 1846 and 1850 cost little short of £3,000,000.

If these were matters which belonged to clear obligation ; if they had contemplated ends ; if they had proceeded on reasonable calculations and upon just aims, far be it from me to quote their cost against them ; but their elements must be taken into view. And what were the causes of most of those wars ; indeed, all of them ? Even the Zulu war, which I look upon as one of the most monstrous in our history—one of the most monstrous in point of policy, and one of the most clearly indefensible in point of principle—was a frontier war. It depended upon frontier considerations. It has always been the defence of a frontier which has been in question. A fighting frontier has been incessantly the cause and object of war. Our tales of frontier policy, and the losses brought on the country in connection with it, will appear to future generations almost fabulous. It will appear extraordinary to them that a country like this should have gone hunting, as it were, to the uttermost parts of the earth to find the means and opportunity of squandering treasure for no conceivable purpose of policy.

On the 9th November, 1879, Lord Beaconsfield made what I think was one of the most unhappy and ominous allusions ever made by a Minister of this country. He quoted certain words easily rendered as ' Empire and Liberty '—words (he said), of a Roman statesman, words descriptive of the state of Rome—and he quoted them as words which were capable of legitimate application to the position and circumstances of England. I joined issue with the Prime Minister upon that subject, and I affirmed that nothing can be more fundamentally unsound, more practically ruinous than the establishment of Roman analogies for the guidance of British policy. What was Rome ? Rome was, indeed, an Imperial State, I may be told—I know not, I cannot read the counsels of Providence—a State having a mission to subdue the world ; but a State whose very basis it was to deny the equal rights, to proscribe the independent existence of other nations. That was the Roman idea. It has been partially and not ill described in three lines of a translation from Virgil by our great poet Dryden, which run as follows ;—

' O Rome ! 'tis thine alone with awful sway
To rule mankind, and make the world obey,
Disposing peace and war thine own majestic way.'

We are told to fall back upon this example. No doubt the word ' Empire ' was qualified with the word ' Liberty.' But what did the two words ' Liberty ' and ' Empire ' mean in a Roman mouth ? They meant simply this — ' Liberty for ourselves, Empire over the rest of mankind.'

WHAT LONDON IS LIKE.

ONE day lately, in London, two 'contents' bills appeared—huge things carried by the multitude of young fellows who sell the evening papers. *The Evening News* is, of course, always easily first, as a yellow sensationalist. This is the paper which, above all others, has done its very best to poison the minds of Londoners against the Boers, to provoke the South African Republic, to insult its president, and to force on war. Its 'contents' bills are one of the scandals of London. The bill on this particular day consisted of one announcement only. In huge letters, this covered the sheet, and this only; 'The Story of the Bull Fight. Graphic description.' And this beastly stuff it knew would sell the paper. *The Sun* came out with a similar flaring placard, containing nothing but an announcement of a Horrible Story of 'Cannibalism at Sea.'

The Speaker lately said truly;—

Little Tich, for nightly falling over his own toes in big boots, drew a larger salary than the most eminent preacher in the country. Many an earnest young curate who is slaving his life away in the slums of our great cities in his endeavour to reform his fellow-men has to work for two years to save the amount that an Arthur Roberts receives for a week of six performances—£100. It is not 'Michael and His Lost Angel' or 'The Broad Road' that lead to fame and fortune, but 'Charley's Aunt,' 'The Private Secretary,' and 'A Night Out,' or, we will add, much worse things than these.

This, from *The Daily Chronicle*, gives another glimpse of our low sensational tastes in London;

At the last moment it has been decided, in order to bring the Drury Lane melodrama quite up to date, to substitute the Dent Blanche, where poor Mr. Jones and his guides lost their lives, for the Matterhorn, in the scene of the avalanche in the Alps, which is to be one of the sensations of the piece.

NOTES BY THE WAY.

THE CAMPAIGN FUND.—We have received four contributions. One from Worthing we cannot acknowledge, as no name was enclosed. We thank and congratulate our four helpers:

'PATRIOTISM IS THE LAST REFUGE OF A SCOUNDREL.'—So said rugged old Samuel Johnson; and Johnson, like Washington, never told a lie. Let no one misunderstand.

There is a genuine patriotism, an honest and unselfish love of country, altogether admirable: but, as we now well know by many swollen examples, there is a patriotism which is only a cover for insolence, an excuse for injustice, and a plea for theft.

We hold that the tendency of real patriotism is to make people concerned for the true honour of the country. But is not the swindler's patriotism always talking of 'the honour of the country'? True, but that sort of honour means, never giving in, never going back, never allowing yourself to be stopped in taking what you want. That is the 'honour rooted in dishonour,' which it is now our sorrowful duty to expose. The 'honour of the country,' as now usually understood, is confided to the keeping of soldiers, and is 'vindicated' when we have smashed some one. What a brazen lie it is!

THE SMOKE CRAZE.—We are sorry to see that Mr. Newman is still defiling that once pleasant and beautiful Queen's Hall. His promenade concerts have recommenced, and he prominently announces 'Smoking permitted.' It is a base pandering to a base taste, and we greatly regret it. That hall used to be agreeable to sit in; but it is being hopelessly spoiled for people with pure tastes and healthy throats and lungs. We are surprised to see that he hopes to secure Fanny Moody, Lucile Hill, Alice Gomez and Antoinette Sterling, to sing through his smoke. We never expected to find these ladies coming so near to the atmosphere and the style of the music halls.

DECADENCE.—We notice in American journals several signs of lowered morals since the ugly uprising of the war spirit in the United States and the development of 'Imperialism' there. Perhaps the most depressing is the case of 'The Christian Register,' the very respectable organ of American Unitarians. In almost every number it prints a sinister paragraph of some kind respecting the South African Republic, evidently intended to support the aristocratic, military and financial robbers, who long to sweep out of the way the sturdy little Republic.

Here is the conclusion of its latest bit of haughty Imperialism; 'A considerable body of Englishmen are opposing with emphasis what they consider the extreme policy of the government toward the Transvaal. If a war is declared, however, there is little probability that any true Briton will attempt to stay the hand of the British government from wreaking the resentment of the past fifty years upon the little State that has blocked progress and thwarted British designs upon the African continent, with a reckless disregard of the consequences of such an obstructive policy upon the British temper, which is now fully aroused, and prepared for energetic and final action looking toward a solution of the South African problem.'

If this is the American way of shewing their accord with England, we do not want it. 'The Christian Register' even

refers to the cowardly and silly offer of help from Canada, and describes it all with the greatest possible gravity; without a word of regret, but with an air of old-world masterfulness, very comical and yet very painful.

DREYFUS.—The great British Philistine-Pharisee honestly enough lifted up its voice and wept incontinently over Dreyfus. It was ever quick to feel the sufferings inflicted by others, and to resent other people's crimes.

By the way, we are assured that what Dreyfus chiefly wants is the restoration of his sword and re-instatement in the army. Poor fool! Why should he care for such an obviously odious profession, and for inclusion in such a disgraceful gang?

Of this same British Philistine-Pharisee, *The Church Gazette* pointedly says; 'Some correspondents of the *Daily Chronicle* have flown into a terrible state of hysterics anent the Boulogne bull-fight, and seem to have taken leave of all sense of proportion, as well as of common sense, judging from the vocabulary they employ. For although the whole business is degrading enough, these zealots seem to forget that it is not a whit worse than a thousand other exhibitions—rabbit coursings, for instance—which are being carried on all over England in the name of sport, and with no word of protest.'

Of late, we have frequently had in our mind that pungent description, from Hudibras, of people who

'Compound for sins they are inclined to,
By damning those they have no mind to.'

THE NEW MISSIONARY.—*Puck* puts before us this grim joke;—

Reverend Goodman: 'Your little boy says he would like to be a missionary to the Filipinos! What put that idea into his head?'

Mrs. Highchurch: 'Why, the dear little fellow wants a shotgun, and his papa won't let him have it!'

BRITISH BLUFF.—The *Washington Star* is laughing at us. Here is its latest;—

'So you think they'll send Oom Paul an ultimatum,' said one diplomat. 'I shouldn't be surprised' answered the other. 'It's a great deal safer than sending soldiers.'

NOTES ON BOOKS.

'A PRIMER OF THE BIBLE.' By W. H. Bennett, M.A., Professor of Biblical Languages and Literature, Hackney Coll., London, &c. London: Methuen & Co. This modest but most upsetting little book will now create very little surprise—so well has the Christian world been prepared for

such revolutionary notions concerning the Bible. Mr. Bennett does not profess to be an original investigator, but he is a decidedly alive reader and editor, and he presents the results of modern inquiry in a manner both comprehensive and concise, without apologies and without excitement. On the contrary, he is, to tell the truth, just a trifle dry; but his book is all the better for that. The various and very dissimilar books that make up the Bible are sorted, dated, described and collated with the history of the Jews; and the composite character of these books is brought strongly out. No one will imagine that we endorse everything we find here, but we say without reserve that it would be difficult to find a better summary of modern knowledge on this vital subject of the compilation of the Bible: and we are bound to say that if the man who credits half that this book tells him thinks he still believes in the Bible as 'The Word of God,' he understands neither this book nor himself.

'HELP FOR SELF-HELP IN IRELAND.' By the Right Hon. Horace Plunkett, M.P. Dublin: 'The Irish Homestead' Office. Only a small pamphlet, or even tract, but telling a perfectly delightful story about what is being done in and for 'distressful Ireland,' all turning upon Agricultural, Dairy and Credit Societies, with other Associations of various kinds for co-operation in developing peasant farming. There are now about 300 societies at work, with some 35,000 members. Ireland is feeling the effect of it in every nerve. This is better than coercion, Mr. Balfour!

CREMATION.

The Banner of Light quotes *The Truthseeker*, which says, 'The Indiana State Board of Health has made an advance in the right direction by recommending cremation instead of burial, giving as a reason the fact that earth is not a disinfectant, and that malignant diseases have sprung from graves. Cremation finds its principal opponent in the Catholic church, which is apprehensive that incineration might weaken faith in the doctrine of the resurrection. According to Grant Allen, the church got this resurrection doctrine from the Egyptians, or some other Eastern people, who mummified their dead, so that their bodies might be preserved to receive the returning soul. Interment is as fatal to such preservation as is cremation, but Catholics are unable to perceive the fact, and probably few of them are aware of the incongruity of belief in the resurrection and the custom of burial in the ground. When the doctrine was pilfered, the mummification which was practiced to make it look plausible should have been adopted by Christendom. Then the church might consistently, if not reasonably, oppose cremation.'

Upon this *The Banner of Light* makes the following spirited remarks;—'The sooner Indiana's example is followed by every State in the Union the better it will be for the American people. When a man commits the crime of murder,

perhaps, in a moment of anger, he is sent to the gallows to suffer the penalty of his rash deed. But citizens can assist in murdering many of their fellowmen through the interment of the bodies of their dead with impunity. The opposition to cremation is almost wholly due to religious prejudice, and the State can do its citizens no greater service than to set them free in the matter of health. Cremation is unquestionably a health preserving measure, hence should be everywhere adopted.

PARADISO.

DEAR pleasant children, come, come and cuddle me!
Cuddle me! Cuddle me!

I have come a long way, and am lonely and tired :
And I want to be loved.
Sometimes, on the hills, I lost my way in the dark ;
And heard the night winds and the wild creatures howl.
Sometimes comrades were kind, but I pushed on my way all
alone.

Sometimes, when I sowed precious seed in the plains,
At the first throb of green the trampling feet came :
And, where I longed for a harvest, I saw a hard road.
Sometimes I was loved, but something soon hurried me on :
And sometimes I loved, but answer and hand did not come.
And once, when I fast held a hand in the gloom,
It shivered in mine, and was gone.
O darlings, I've come a long way, and am tired.
Come to me! Come to me! Cuddle me!
Cuddle me! Cuddle me! Come!

PURGATORIO.

DEAR naughty children, come and I'll cuddle you,
Cuddle you, cuddle you.

I have heard the birds sing, and seen the blue sky :
I will fold you in sunshine and music and joy.
O the sights I have seen !
I have seen the snow mountains lit up with the glory of gold,
And the clouds laugh with crimson for joy of the sun.
I have been with the sullen and seen them look up and smile
At a kiss on the brow, at a word in the ear.
I have learnt that the naughty are only the sad.
They are wronged, or they think so, and then they resent it
and fret.

And there, in the gloom, the rank poison grows.
Ah, come to me, darlings ; it's so sunny and sweet here !
Come to me now, and see how I'll cuddle you,
Cuddle you! Cuddle you! Come!

J.P.H.